

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the May 3, 2007 Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 7-13, 20-26, 53-70 and 80-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants amend the claims herein to remove the element allegedly not taught. Applicants now maintain all claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C § 112.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 7, 20, 33, 53-55, 58, 60-64, 67, 69-73, 76, 78-82 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087584 to Hung, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,318 issued to Rivette, et al. The rejection asserts that Hung allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for receiving an un-prompted identification, which is allegedly taught by Rivette. Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung and Rivette in further view of the Freeze reference. The rejection asserts that Hung and Rivette allegedly teach each element of the claims except for transferring a document into a folder, which is allegedly taught by Freeze. Claims 56, 57, 59, 65, 66, 68, 74, 75, 77 and 83-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung and Rivette in further view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,725,228 issued to Clark et al. The rejection asserts that Hung and Rivette allegedly teaches each element

of the claims except for transferring a document into a folder based on attributes on the message, which is allegedly taught by Clark. Claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 90-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung and Rivette in further view of Clark and in further view of Freeze. The rejection asserts that Hung, Rivette and Clark allegedly teach each element of the claims except for transferring a document into a second folder, which is allegedly taught by Freeze.

The claims as amended are directed toward transferring a document to a folder based on identification of a portion of the document. The identification is performed by a user and is an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document while presenting the document, wherein the un-prompted identification is performed by speaking. Each independent claim is amended herein to include similar language. Thus, in the present invention, the user simply identifies a portion of the document by speaking. Once the user identifies a portion of the document, the document is automatically transferred into a folder based on the un-prompted identification portion.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests having an un-prompted identification by speaking. Hung, Freeze and Clark do not teach any un-prompted identification. Rivette does teach identification of a portion of the document, but only with clicking on the portion of the document with a special identification tool, a pen tool in the example given in Rivette. There is not teaching of speaking the portion the user desires to identify.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96.

Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 54-61, 63-70, 72-79 and 81-95 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 54-61, 63-70, 72-79 and 81-95 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 54-61, 63-70, 72-79 and 81-95.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated July 3, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/  
James T. Hagler  
Reg. No. 40,631  
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502